



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

## 1 Sam. 13 21

THE rendering "pim" at 1 Sam. 13 21 in the new Jewish version of the Scriptures is illuminating in several ways. It exemplifies the utility of excavation; it exemplifies the fact that a Masoretic reading which critics have unanimously condemned as hopelessly corrupt may have been exactly right all the time; it gives intelligibility to the text itself.

The plan of their work forbade the translators to make this justification of the first Masoretic words a basis for any emendation of the words which follow. But obviously the attitude of the LXX in finding the word שְׁקֵל in the midst of וְלִשְׁלֹשׁ קִלְשׁוֹן is powerfully supported by "pim". If we say that the fee was a pim for the sharpening of tools listed by name, this calls at once for some mention of those for which the charge was something else than a pim; otherwise why the list of tools, why not let the sentence end at "pim"?

When we have "pim" and a list of tools, and then the letters שְׁקֵל in a group of letters for which no satisfactory meaning has otherwise been found, it ought to need no further demonstration that the last part of the verse is a list of those for which a shekel was charged. There remains the question how to dispose of the letters surrounding שְׁקֵל.

We read in the first place, then, that the fee was a pim לְמַחְרֶשֶׁת וְלֵאמֹר שְׁלֹשׁ. Do we hear elsewhere of the שְׁלֹשׁ? Yes, in 2 Sam. 6, 7, where again it has been an unsolved difficulty: traditional interpretation makes it an abstract noun, but Klostermann and Smith have already seen and said that it ought to be that upon which Uzzah falls as he is struck down, presumably

a part of the cart. If we may recognize the same word in 1 Sam. 13 21, then we learn that it was a sharp iron. Now we know that a man may die from Jahveh's stroke without other weapon; nevertheless, if the stroke throws him down upon a sharp iron, the mention of the fact seems very pertinent to the record of his death.

In the next place, שָׁקֶל imperatively requires to be followed by ל, as פִּים is; and we may regard the dagesh of the Masoretic text as the relic of this additional ל. Supplying this ל, we find that the fee was a shekel לְשֹׁן וְלִהְיוֹת הָרֶבֶן. The motive for the higher fee is that the ax is a larger and heavier tool than the hoe or colter, demanding more labor for its sharpening, and that in shoeing the goad the smith had to contribute not only his labor but a piece of iron. As to the preceding piece, we do not know שֹׁן; we know לְשֹׁן, but not as a piece of iron. Once the לְשֹׁן is a piece of metal, Achan's לְשֹׁן of gold. The fact that the English Bible renders this by "wedge" will not seem to anybody to have great evidential value for the interpretation of our passage; nevertheless we may perhaps take a hint from it. The wedge is a tool used since primitive times, heavy enough to make the smith much work in sharpening if it has grown as dull as the Hebrew peasant probably let it grow before he carried it down to Philistia and paid a shekel for sharpening it; and it might well be called לְשֹׁן. Of course the reading of the noun לְשֹׁן requires us to assume that the text had originally לָלָל, which copyists reduced to a single ל with dagesh; but it is not violent to suppose that if לָלָל occurred in an unintelligible sequence of letters there would be a tendency to simplify the gemination in copying.

What we have thus obtained, if we resist the temptation to supply also a conjunction before שָׁקֶל, is "and the charge for sharpening was a pim for hoes and colters and *shal*, a shekel for wedge and ax and for shoeing a goad". Here we have given a motive to the listing of the tools that cost a pim, we have put meaning into the unintelligible word in the middle, and we have obtained from this passage a definite indication as to the meaning of an unintelligible word found elsewhere. Our income from the operation is thus considerable; it is time

to look at the expenses, for there are reasons for not being too positive of it all.

In the first place, the proposed emendations give us two singulars in a series of plurals. However, **ררבן** is singular already, and in Judges 9 48 the plural form of **קרדם** has singular meaning, while we know little of the syntax of the other two words. In the next place, I find it difficult to think of any sharpened iron that belongs to a cart, or that would be carried in driving a cart, so that a person suddenly struck down should fall upon it; unless it be the goad, and in our passage the goad appears with another name. In the third place, in the use of a wedge it is ordinarily best economy of strength to start the wedge in a cleft made by an ax, so that the wedge does not need to be very sharp; however, if the Hebrew held it long enough before taking it to the smith it might get so dull that it could not be used anyhow. Obviously the effect of the high charge would be to make the sharpening come seldom and hence to make it a very hard job when it was done, and the smith may have worked hard enough to earn what he got. In the fourth place, if we knew the tool to be a wedge (though in fact this is the part of our conjecture that has least foundation) there is no reason why the wedge should not be just as likely to be called **שן** as **לשון**, and **שן** could be got out of the received text just as easily as **לשון**; or one might even retain the **ל** by assuming that the wedge was called by a name that was originally a dialectic variant of **שן**, with different vowel. A fact that should be remembered in all conjecturing, though I think it commonly is not, is that a passage containing an unfamiliar word or words is naturally more exposed to corruption than one in which all the words are familiar, and hence a hundred lines of corrupt text will, if restored to their true original, contain decidedly more hapax-legomena (which, bear in mind, will be words that are not now known to have existed at all) than do a hundred lines of uncorrupted text. This consideration cuts a great part of the foundation from under the whole business of conjecture, since the foundation has generally to consist in an attempt to restore words such as we are already acquainted with; on the other hand, a conjecture which produces

an unheard-of word, which will generally be regarded as the most reckless type of conjecture, may claim at least that it has more chance of being right than any one would allow it at first glance. Ordinarily, to be sure, one will sooner acquiesce in an unintelligible traditional text than create by conjecture an equally unintelligible text; so we simmer down to Porson's "Conjectural readings are worth a farthing a cartload". But in the present instance the sense requires שָׁקַל and שָׁקַל lies before our eyes in the traditional text.

Ballard Vale, Mass.

Steven T. Byington

### חֶשֶׁךְ

The Hebrew Lexicon under חֶשֶׁךְ cites Palmyrene Aramaic as using this word in the meanings given by Vogüé. Some users of the Lexicon may not have Vogüé at hand, and it is a safe guess that not every one who could get a look at Vogüé will take the look. It will not be superfluous, therefore, to set forth what I found when I looked up the texts.

The two occurrences that are cited are from bilingual honorific inscriptions for statues of men who have deserved this honor because each of them, among other merits, חֶשֶׁךְ certain moneys. The first presumption, to me, is that the word will have the same meaning in the two passages. Vogüé recognizes no such presumption, but gives quite dissimilar meanings, each of which he arrives at by rejecting the testimony of the Palmyrenes themselves as furnished by their Greek translation.

The Greek of inscription 15 translates חֶשֶׁךְ by ἀφειδήσαντα. Inscription 6 is defective, but according to Vogüé's restoration we should read ἀφειδήσαντι there also. Vogüé's note on 15 remarks that the meaning of חֶשֶׁךְ as shown by Hebrew usage is exactly contrary to ἀφειδήσαντα, and that the meaning φείδω, not ἀφειδέω, is congruous to the other statements about the man's services. But here is the same fallacy that one may observe sometimes in certain works of Biblical criticism, of starting from the text as if it were a free composition, and not observing that the author is likely to have been bound by the facts, whether actual or traditional, which he had to record.